

## TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS DEFENSE AND EDUCATION FUND

16 Monte Cimas Avenue Mill Valley, CA 94941 415-380-8600 383-0776 fax

December 16, 2005  
By E-Mail & Fax

Dan Leavitt, Deputy Director  
CA High Speed Rail Authority  
925 L Street, Suite 1425  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Scoping Comments for Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Train

Dear Mr. Leavitt:

The Transportation Solutions Defense and Education Fund, TRANSDEF, has been an advocate for the regional planning of transportation, land use and air quality for the past decade. We were active in preserving the Transbay Terminal as the terminus for High-Speed Rail in California. On the basis of our familiarity with Bay Area transportation issues, we offer the following scoping comments on the EIS/R being prepared for the Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Train.

### Alternative Definition

Define an Altamont alternative as follows:

1. Use the HSR portion (gold colored lines) and lower-speed local portions (red colored lines) of the plan drawn by Architecture 21, available at <http://www.arch21.org/BARegRail.dir/regrailindex.html> and as shown in more detail in maps linked to [http://www.arch21.org/CaHighSpeed.dir/Altamont\\_Tour.dir/tourindex.html](http://www.arch21.org/CaHighSpeed.dir/Altamont_Tour.dir/tourindex.html)
2. Assume that an all-day expanded ACE service shares the HSR tracks to San Jose, using the same trainsets as HSR so as to be compatible (they might possibly be designed for 125 mph instead of 225 mph to save weight and money). These trains would stop at HSR and local stations as defined above. Service levels would be designed to meet demand at local stops, with many or most trains turning around at Fremont or Livermore to go back to San Jose. This service would be an upgrade of the currently planned BART extension to San Jose, and would replace it. Use the ridership projections developed by the Regional Rail Study. For an example of a schedule that intermingles HSR and local trains, see <http://mtcwatch.com/Transit%20Maps/Rapid%20Exports/HSRinfo.pdf>

3. Build the local stations with 3 or 4 tracks through them, as needed, to allow HSR trains to pass through them safely, as well as to pass these ACE local trains. Build passing tracks as needed to allow HSR trains to get around local trains which serve more stops.
4. Count the ship traffic that currently passes through/under the Dumbarton rail bridge. Evaluate trends to determine whether more ship traffic is likely in the future. On the basis of that analysis, determine whether a low bridge would suffice, if the swing only needed to be opened a few times a year. Determine the potential interruption of train schedules for that scenario. On the basis of this analysis, evaluate this alternative with either a low bridge or a replacement high bridge.

Methodology

1. Evaluate each alternative for unused capacity to carry more trains.
2. Evaluate each alternative for total population living within 20 miles of the tracks.
3. Evaluate each alternative for potential additional ridership to be gained by serving local, interregional, commuter and intercity markets, using compatible trainsets.
4. Evaluate how well each alternative serves Silicon Valley north of San Jose.
5. Carefully peer review all downtown San Jose land use projections for feasibility, political reality, airport flight path height limitations and impacts on adjacent neighborhoods. Evaluate the feasibility of these projections in the context of other San Jose planning initiatives which encourage more parking lots downtown, along with growth in the North First Street area and in Coyote Valley. We are concerned that current projections used for the BART extension project appear to have been manipulated to affect the cost-effectiveness analysis.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,

/s/ David Schonbrunn

David Schonbrunn,  
President